

MTAC MEETING NOTES
Wednesday May 21, 2014

First Class Mail

Garrett discussed proposed DMM changes to allow fewer than 200 piece (Permit Imprint) mailings for mailers participating in Seamless parallel and Seamless.

DMM 604.5.1.2 New Exception

Proposed Language:

h. Single Piece priced mailings that are presented by a mailer or mail owner participating in Seamless Acceptance Parallel or Seamless Acceptance may submit mailings of fewer than 200 pieces. Each piece in the mailing must be uniquely barcoded and documented in electronic documentation.

Discussion of possible A.I. Clarification needed: The industry asked if this DMM change would necessitate changes to vendor software.

Pritha said MEPT was still deciding the date of the next major release.

Pritha reminded the group that ACS is free as long as a unique barcode is used.

Discussion of possible A.I. from Industry Pushback: Requests change of current requirement from Seamless to Full Service participation.

"Pain Point" document was not shared with meeting; it will not be posted on RIBBS with the MTAC PowerPoint presentation.

Discussion of possible A.I. MEPT will clarify whether registration is 12 or 13 months and will add to Seamless Guide.

Pritha said the August 24 release would bring many FS and Seamless upgrades.

Move Update failures will be incorporated into Mailer Scorecard as a line item.

Bob Dixon discussed CRID cleanup for existing CRIDs; he said it would be optional for the industry, that USPS would provide help with the cleanup. The industry responded positively. The mailer Scorecard was discussed. It will make MERLIN unnecessary. The Invoice was described as the loss of the FS discount above the threshold.

MTAC group 143 will discuss invoicing at length today.

FS pieces are excluded from the Move Update Invoice threshold.

Pritha answered a question about possible Postal Inspector investigations of mailers due to invoicing by replying that the Inspection Service might conduct investigations but that it would do so independent of MEPT.

Discussion of possible A.I. Clarity needed on Move Update-Will Move Update include non-auto pieces. Response: Simplified Address Pieces are not included in the census of Move Update eligible pieces.

Garrett reminded the group that Move Update would be part of the Thursday 11:00-12:30 MTAC meeting.

Garrett discussed the FS Invoice-review. There were no questions.

The industry requested clarification about verifications related to machinable non-barcoded pieces.

Discussion of possible A.I. Pritha asked for volunteers to review and comment on the Roadmap document (3 parts: eInduction, Seamless and Full Service). Our expectation is that it will be released quickly-after review and comments.

The 8017 process was discussed. MEPT is looking closely at the many eInduction issues for PSI.

A.I Industry requested clarity: The industry asked about the use of content placards on trays-which are not scanned.

Pritha discussed our intent to move all eligible mailers (90% FS mailings to Seamless Parallel. During the discussion about future part time, random clerk staffing at DMUs, there was some pushback from Sharon, who understood that USPS employees would not need to physically access her production facilities. This does not appear to be a widespread industry concern. BME will continue to do manual verifications during Seamless Parallel.

The issue surrounding undocumented pieces was the biggest single problem for the industry. Ad-hoc definition of Undoc: Found the piece but can't find payment.

MEPT wants to Identify MSPs with a high Undoc rate with the knowledge that 1 MID can be used across multiple mailers. A new report in August will identify mailers by MID usage.

Pritha explained the invoicing appeals process and said that much as we provide scan data for eVS today, we will do the same for Seamless mailings.

Beth discussed MXD trays and changes coming to these trays in the August release.

Metered Neither discussion included mailer options.

Discussion of possible A.I. Volunteers were asked to provide input for a suggested program to pay box fees through CAPS. Sharon volunteered.

Discussion of possible A.I. elnduction Issue There may be a gap for mailers if USPS goes ahead with requiring use of current Label List at time of induction. The industry says there are overlapping times and that this must be accounted for. Also, the 99% rule requires clarification.

Discussion of possible A.I. Industry should define variable piece weight piece weights.

Periodicals/Standard Mail Discussion

Garrett led the Mail Anywhere discussion.

Uni discussed August REL modification to maximum weight for non-machinable pieces.

New MTAC Group 162 was mentioned.

The industry suggested that any invoicing be accompanied by a cell phone or email notification.

Kelly discussed Scan-based elnduction for non-SV sites; he identified the front end-back end verifications performed. He noted that it may be necessary to have additional documentation in non-SV scan sites. He also discussed some of the elnduction issues identified through deployment that will be resolved.

Pritha provided a Seamless overview and noted that there would be less future reliance on DMU employee sampling.

Discussion of possible A.I. The piece weight test will be expanded to include the effects of high humidity on piece weight, and that the next test should account for all possible variances. The industry will provide volunteers names when they meet next week; Randy Workman will be the USPS lead.

There was a discussion about when container placards are required. Pritha requested that the industry provide their feedback.

Wanda asked that the Move Update process be discussed at the next day's MTAC Group 143 meeting.

The industry pointed out that a gap might exist when the induction date begins to be used as the Start-the- Clock time because of overlap with new Label Lists. There was a discussion about different Start-the-clock metrics; one when inducted at a local dock, another when the mail is part of a long-haul and we use a different date.

The Move Update invoice calculation will equals the Aged Addresses (move than 95 days old) divided by the total mail volume subject to Move Update.

Garrett provided more discussion on Invoicing and offered more discussion at Work group 163 discussion. (Bob-as industry lead with Randy as the USPS lead). He said there would be three options for mailers where Invoicing occurred: the MSP could assign responsibility to mail Owner, the MSP could acknowledge responsibility and pay the Invoice or the charges could be disputed.

It was noted that Move Update may be the Mail Owner's responsibility in an Invoicing situation.

The “Meter/Neither” issue from the Pulse of the Industry report was reviewed by Lance Bell. Using one option to meter at Suggested prices could mirror pre-canceled stamp prices (FCM \$0.25, STD Mail \$0.10, Nonprofit \$0.05). This meter option was approved by the USPS for the next major PostalOne release (January 2015). With all the various incentives/promotions, IMb Full-Service and other discounted rates, it is becoming more difficult for mailers to accurately identify the lowest meter amount in a mailing. A concept was developed to remove the “metered lowest” option, but leave the “metered exact” and “metered neither” in place.

The policy for the “go-to” postage prices for out of date labeling lists was **unclear as to what will happen in terms of consequences if the mailer uses the wrong file**. Pritha Mehra said the capability to look at the Labeling List and Mail Direction Files for eDoc is being added in the software release so that the USPS can verify that the mailing is prepared using current presort and entry data. Starting in August, mailers and service providers doing IMb Full-Service mailings will have the ability to access reports and data in their Mailer Scorecard on nesting and sortation errors from eDoc, which would include anywhere the presort does not reflect the current Label List data and other types of presort errors. There will be separate error/warning categories in the Scorecard introduced with the August release. In August, the USPS system will compare the Labeling List in effect on the postage statement mailing date against the data provided in eDoc. Starting in October, the system will check the two active Labeling Lists against the actual date of induction of the mail to USPS. **If errors are found, they are considered presort errors. The USPS said it plans to give mailers time to look at reports, digest the data and resolve the issues, as well as collecting data on error levels to determine an appropriate threshold before it begins assessing additional postage.**

Packages

Heather made a presentation, followed a discussion about de-linking child MIDS.

Discussion of possible A.I. For the next meeting there will be a report MIDs that are incorrectly manifested where a child MID is incorrectly manifested on a different eVS master where some submitted MIDs never make it into the manifest bucket. It is also possible that a record may initially show as un-manifested in a report but may be later reconciled when payment is received on a different master.

Discussion of possible A.I. During a discussion on un-manifested pieces, the industry requested better reports to show tracking events and requested that an Event Code be included in report or extract – customers want to see the origin event process and would prefer the report to an extract.

Pritha continued the discussion about the Invoicing appeal process – she agreed that more documents needed to be made available to mailers.

The industry said mailers would like to be able to deactivate a MID, using a process similar to the way a credit card is cancelled.

Pritha wants to work out any package problems with the industry. She said we could analyze scan data where the MID is used by the mailer’s client.

Tanya discussed BCG. After the application was opened for the group to view, Pritha agreed that the onboarding process is not completely transparent.

Discussion of possible A.I. Pritha said MEPT would revisit BCG onboarding with an eye toward creating greater customer transparency.

